



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/841,950	04/08/1997	MARK D. RIGGINS	40827.00004	3712

30256 7590 07/30/2003

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.  
600 HANSEN WAY  
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER

SEAL, JAMES

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/841,950	04/08/1997	MARK D. RIGGINS	40827.00004	3712

30256 7590 06/27/2003

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P  
600 HANSEN WAY  
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER

SEAL, JAMES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003

467

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

08/841,950

Applicant(s)

RIGGINS, MARK D.

Examiner

James Seal

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 8-14, 16-30 and 32-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 8-14, 16-30 and 32-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The request filed on 08 April 2003, for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 35CFR 132 based on parent application No. 08/841950 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
2. The IDS has been considered and a signed copy enclosed.
3. Amended claims 5-6, 8, 10, 19-20, 22, 29, 30, 32, 37 and 38 have been entered.
4. Claim 39 has been added.
5. Claims 7, 21 have been cancelled without prejudice.
6. Claims 2-6, 8-14, 16-30, and 32-39 are pending.

*Drawings*

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings that are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

***Objection to the Specification***

8. Objection withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. Claims 2-6, 8-14, 16-30, and 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vogel (5,815,683 A), and further in view of Rosenow et. al. (US 5483596 A), Montague et. al. (US 5675782 A), and Pilc et. al. (US 5510777 A)
10. Claim 1 has been cancelled.

11. As per amended claim 6, the limitations of a communication system linking client with web server is disclosed by Vogler Figure 1, elements 16 that is the Internet is the network that supports the world wide web). The further limitations, that security services are coupled to the web server, which determine access and authentication of the client determining client's remote privileges (Figure 2, element 18, 20, and 22) as well as enabling client to select among *different* (other) services (via a Browser (e.g. Netscape Navigator or later Column 4, lines 18-19); figure 4 elements 44, 42, and 46, and Column 1, lines 37-40; column 4 lines 9-19) for example CAD tools communication services, etc, Column 1, lines 37-40) is disclosed by Vogel. Vogel discloses one user authentication per request for service (for example a CAD problem) and is silent on presenting the user with a plurality of user authentication protocol options, each user authentication protocol option having a particular level of authentication associated with it for authenticating the user according to at least one user authentication protocol. Montague, however, discloses presenting the user with a plurality of services for remote access and the use of user access rights with respect to applications which are controlled (Figure 2 and Column 3, lines 9-26). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the system of Vogel's with that of Montague because most users require flexibility especially in engineering designed, that is the use of CAD and expert program and with a number of services provided to the user, comes the need for access control and digital rights management. Vogel/Montague are silent on the issue for the need of additional authentication which may vary for the access required. Pilc et. al. disclose a system which uses additional authentication which

depends on the level of additional security for the particular request (Column 2, lines 19-30). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Vogel/Montague with the teachings of Pilc as the additional services of Montague would entail additional limitations of resources and security and this would be provided by Pilc. Although Vogel's Facilitator provides to the client service communications code that enables communication with a selected service (Figure 1, Elements 14 (host engine), 12 and 10) Vogel is silent on whether these services are coupled to the security services or the use of keys stored in a secure memory (key safe) at the host that enable the client to access the available services without storing service communication codes and keys at the client.

12. Rosenow provides a secure system for accessing files over a switched network for (figure 1, elements 46, 12, and 50 and figure 2), using resource authorization keys and access on the access controller (Figure 2, element 48 and Column 4, lines 47-55). Thus Rosenow authorization keys and resources are located at the server. Thus Rosenow when combined with Vogel would provide the details of security needed by Vogel. Claim 6 is rejected.

13. Claim 7 is cancelled.

11. Claims 2-5 and claims 8-14 are dependent on claim 6. The limitations brought by claims 2 (SSL), 3 (encryption protocol), 4 (public key encryption) and 5 (public key certificates to authenticate) are well known methods for secure communications over a network and are well known in the cryptologic arts, One of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to combine Vogel/ Montague Pilc/Rosenow, as necessary methods for implementing a secure network.

14. Claims 8-14 are also dependent on claims 6, the limitations of claims 11 (firewalls) and claim 14 (proxy) are well know in the network security arts and would be implemented on any system which carried secure information across a network. Claim 8 relates to the determination of privileges of the user(see Column 3, lines 9-45 Montague), claims 10 the limitation of authentication information (pilc, Column 2, lines 19-30) and the use of codes to negotiate devices claims 9, 12, 13, and 14 (see Rosenow Abstract)). Claims 2-5 and 8-14 are rejected.

12. Claim 15 has been cancelled.

13. Claims 20, consist of a computer based method for implementing 6 and is rejected by the same prior art of record. Claim 20 is rejected.

15. Claim 21 is cancelled.

16. As per dependent claims 16-19, 22-28, these address a computer-based method address by claims 2-5, 8-14 and are rejected in view of the same art.

17. Claim 29 now recites a server computer system. Such variations are disclosed by Vogel ( Column 2, lines 63-67). Claim 29 is rejected.

18. Claim 30 recites a computer based storage medium for implementing claim 6 and rejected in view of the same prior art of record. Claim 30 is rejected.

19. Claim 31 cancelled.

Art Unit: 2131

20. Claim 32 is a method for receiving the data in an advanced communication and secured network to implement claim 6 and is rejected by the same prior art of record.

Claim 32 rejected.

21. Claims 33-36 are dependent on claim 32 and recite the association of keys with services and determination of client privileges using stored information see especially Rosenow, claims 10-11.

22. Claim 37 recites a system plus means for the communication system recited in claim 32. Claim 37 is rejected.

23. As per claim 38 recites a computer readable storage medium for the communication system claimed in claim 32. Claim 38 rejected.

24. As per claim 39, is a server computer system (for communicating, security, access control and providing services) and web server (for presenting information to user) for implementing the system with the limitations recited in claim 6 and is rejected in view of the same prior art of record.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Seal whose telephone number is 703 308 4562. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gail Hayes can be reached on 703 305 9711. The fax phone numbers for



Art Unit: 2131

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 746 7239 for regular communications and 703 746 7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 3900.

JWS

Jws  
June 25, 2003

*Gail Hayes*

GAIL HAYES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100